

## REMARKS

The following remarks are submitted to address the above amendments and issues raised in the Official Action mailed June 13, 2006.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 8 and 9 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-7 and 10 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,858. Claims 2-5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,014,436 to Tunis in view of U.S. Patent No. 646,638 to Cutler. Claims 2-3, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,793 to Oakley in view of Tunis, and further in view of either U.S. Patent No. 2,755,924 to Tuttle et al. or U.S. Patent No. 5,791,470 to Usui. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Tunis or Oakley, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,190,151 to Russell. Claims 1-7 and 10 have been canceled herein. Claims 8-9 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

No new matter has been added. Support for requested amendments can be found in the original claims and throughout the present specification and drawings. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### Claims 1-7 and 10 — 35 USC § 101

The rejections of claims 1-7 and 10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,858 are respectfully traversed. Claims 1-7 and 10 have been canceled herein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-7 and 10 are now moot. For this reason, the

Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claim 1-7 and 10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

**Claims 2-5 and 7 — 35 USC § 103(a)**

The rejections of claims 2-5 and 7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tunis in view of Cutler are respectfully traversed. Claims 2-5 and 7 have been canceled herein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 2-5 and 7 are now moot. For this reason, the Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 2-5 and 7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tunis in view of Cutler.

**Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 — 35 USC § 103(a)**

The rejections of claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oakley in view of Tunis, and further in view of either Tuttle et al. or Usui are respectfully traversed. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 have been canceled herein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 are now moot. For this reason, the Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oakley in view of Tunis, and further in view of either Tuttle et al. or Usui.

**Claim 6 — 35 USC § 103(a)**

The rejection of claims 6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Tunis or Oakley, and further in view of Russell is respectfully traversed. Claim 6 has been canceled herein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 6 is now moot. For this reason, the Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Tunis or Oakley, and further in view of Russell.

**Claims 8-9 — Allowable Subject Matter**

The objections to claims 8-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claims are respectfully traversed.

The Official Action states that claims 8-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (Official Action, para. 5.) Claims 8-9 have been rewritten herein in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-9 should be allowable.

For all of these reasons, the Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the objections to claims 8-9.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that a full and complete response has been made herein to the Official Action and, as such, all pending claims in this application are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests early consideration of the present application, entry of all amendments herein requested, withdrawal of all rejections and objections, and allowance of all pending claims.

The Office is respectfully invited to contact J. Michael Boggs at (336) 747-7536, to discuss any matter relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/13/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Michael Boggs  
Reg. No. 46,563

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
1001 West Fourth Street  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101-2400  
(336) 747-7536 (Phone)  
(336) 734-2632 (Facsimile)